

Study Asks More Power For Secretary of State

By Victor Wilson
WASHINGTON, Feb. 5.—The breadth and complexity of American foreign policy will never be conquered by a grand council of "wise men," a "super-cabinet" First Secretary, nor a "super-staff" in the White House, Senate staff study declared today.

The best way to meet the problem, the report said, is to give the Secretary of State more power and authority—which in essence means the full confidence and support of the President—and a little time, now and then, to put his feet up and just think.

The study was prepared by the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, of which Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D., Wash., is chairman.

The Secretary's task can be made easier, too, the report asserted, by cementing his working relations with other branches of the government, particularly the Defense Department; by recruiting resources and "talent" both from within and without his own department, and finally by being "available" in the capital "to the President, the Congress, and his own department."

American diplomatic protocol, like that of most large countries, the study said, is based upon precepts laid down at the Congress of Vienna nearly 150 years ago.

By following this protocol, it went on, this country's Secretary of State must spend a lot of his time representing the United States abroad at conferences, becoming involved "in time-consuming ceremonial duties," and burdening himself with social obligations, receptions and greeting visiting foreigners.

The study suggested a world conference to change all this. Out of it might come agreement that lesser diplomatic officials—with more authority—could represent their nations at high-level meetings, and for "drastically reduced protocol-type entertaining" when top-level government officials do travel abroad.

The Senate subcommittee has held numerous hearings, mostly closed, over many months, on ways and means of organizing, developing and executing foreign and defense policies.

Witnesses included Robert A. Lovett, former Defense Secretary; Christian A. Herter, former Secretary of State; Averell Harriman, recently named President Kennedy's ambassador-at-large; George F. Kennan, former State Department expert on Soviet affairs, and Gov. Rockefeller of New York.

"Foul-Up" Factor

The study attacked what it called "the exuberant growth" of inter-agency co-ordinating committees, whose affairs impinge, to some degree, on foreign policy, permitting them to share power, but not responsibility, for decisions. Mr. Lovett called this the "foul-up" factor, adding:

"... The idea seems to have got around that just because some decision may affect your activities, you automatically have a right to take part in making it. ... There is some reason to feel that the doctrine may be getting out of hand, and that what was designed to act as a policeman may, in fact, become a jailer."

The study said that "a very high percentage of such committees serve no useful purpose. Or else, performing a necessary service in the beginning, they live on long after their reason for being has ended."

It endorsed a proposal by Mr. Harriman that a "committee-killing outfit" be set up to "identify those which merit extinction."

The study was critical too, of past lack of co-ordination between the State and Defense Departments despite the fact that the latter may be called upon to enforce policy—possibly by arms—created by the former.

Partnership Urged

"Despite the deep-seated differences of tradition and outlook which have stood between the Pentagon and Foggy Bottom," the report said, "a full and sympathetic partnership . . . is critical to achieving our national security goals. The partnership will be still-born," it added, "unless the two Secretaries themselves set its tone and style. They need frequent and unburied opportunities to talk together, think together and plan together."

Dean Rusk is now Secretary of State, and the new Defense Secretary is Robert S. McNamara.

The report proposed that

while the Secretary of State "need not and should not" concern himself with Defense Department budgetary details, it should have his views at budget-making time "on underlying political-strategic assumptions, and on the relationship of proposed force levels and weapons systems to our foreign problems."

Moreover, it continued, the President should seek the counsel of both Secretaries on their budgetary needs, and not set an arbitrary ceiling himself and impose it upon them.

Other recommendations included:

Responsibility for execution of foreign policy by a single department (preferably State) even though several departments are concerned;

Encouragement of personnel exchange between various agencies concerned with foreign policy to produce more rounded executives.

Exchange of both career and civilian personnel between State and Defense Departments for the same goal, and eventual inclusion of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Treasury, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Budget Bureau in the exchange program.

Sen. Jackson issued a statement today supporting the study's recommendations. Serving with him on the bipartisan subcommittee are Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey, Minn., and Edmund S. Muskie, Me., Democrats, and Karl E. Mundt, S.D., and Jacob K. Javits, N.Y., Republicans.

property to the city of Kenosha, Wis. This bill is designed to clarify an unfortunate situation which has developed in connection with the proposed transfer of property no longer used by the Navy which is needed by Kenosha for an expansion of their waterworks.

The property in question has been reliably and objectively appraised at \$7,500. It consists of some land and abandoned buildings, which are rapidly deteriorating. The Navy's official appraisal of the property, based on their prior use of the facility as a Reserve training center, is \$69,400. The existence of the large divergence between the two appraisals is the reason for this bill.

Incidentally, the Navy has told me it intends under no circumstances to use the property again.

The Navy informs me that it has no use for the property. There appears to be no other military use for it. The present value is clearly about \$7,500. But technical and legal requirements prevent the Navy from lowering its price to a figure which could be met by the city of Kenosha.

The consequent delay is causing serious concern in Kenosha. The entire waterworks expansion program may have to be reconsidered unless the Navy property becomes available soon.

My bill calls for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land to the city of Kenosha for a sum not to exceed \$7,500, the fair appraisal price. I hope it will make possible a speedy and satisfactory solution to this unfortunate bureaucratic tangle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2217) to provide for the disposal of certain property to the city of Kenosha, Wis., introduced by Mr. PROXMIER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN VETERANS FROM REPAYMENT OF SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to relieve veterans in Alaska who received subsistence allowances under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 from repayment of the allowances so received. Having made as detailed a study as available records permit, I am convinced that these allowances were received in reliance upon erroneous information which the veterans obtained from their instructors in the on-the-farm training program.

After World War II, Alaska was favored with many young men and their families, who sought to develop Alaska's infant agriculture. The land they homesteaded required clearing and the basic, hard, costly pioneering farmwork which is always necessary in areas where the land has never been plowed or furrowed.

To improve their agricultural techniques, these young men enrolled in the

on-the-farm training program. The instructors for the program were provided by the University of Alaska, which had a contract for this purpose with the Veterans' Administration.

According to reliable information furnished me, instructors in the on-the-farm training program advised students that their eligibility for subsistence allowances would not be affected adversely by reason of off-the-farm employment. It was said that the Government knew of the off-the-farm employment engaged in by the students enrolled in the training program, that in most cases it was the Federal Government itself which employed such students off the farm, that the long summer hours of daylight in Alaska made off-the-farm employment and on-the-farm training reconcilable, and that Alaska farmers converting virgin, forested lands into paying farms faced economic problems which made impracticable prohibition of off-the-farm employment in Alaska. These were the reasons given to the students for the information transmitted to them by the instructors.

Subsequently, the Veterans' Administration found that trainees receiving off-the-farm employment were, in fact, not eligible for subsistence allowances under the act of 1944. At first, the VA assessed the University of Alaska. Later, the VA assessed the veterans themselves.

The bill I introduce today would promote substantial justice because the Alaska veterans acted in reasonable reliance upon the statements of instructors in the program and received subsistence allowances under a pardonable misapprehension as to the law. Under the bill, veterans who have not paid the amount assessed against them would be relieved of liability. Veterans who have paid would receive refunds.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2218) to relieve certain veterans who relied upon erroneous information from repayment of subsistence allowances paid to them under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY-MACHINERY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to include at this point in the RECORD the announcement of forthcoming hearings before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. On last Friday the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], chairman of the subcommittee, announced that Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara will appear before the subcommittee during a concluding series of public hearings on how our Government can best staff and organize itself to outthink, outplan, and outperform world communism. The

hearings will begin at the end of July and continue through August.

The Senator from Washington said:

These windup hearings, like those the subcommittee held last year, will take a frank and searching look at the number one problem facing our country—the planning and management of national security policy.

The list of witnesses appearing at the hearings also includes the names of Director of the Bureau of the Budget David Bell and his predecessor in the Eisenhower administration, Maurice Stans. Assistant Secretary of Defense—Comptroller—Charles J. Hitch will also testify, as will Wilfred J. McNeil, president of the Grace Line, who served as comptroller of the Department of Defense during both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations.

The dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Public Administration, Don K. Price, will also testify.

The names of additional witnesses and hearing dates will be announced later.

The hearings—

The Senator from Washington added—

will continue the subcommittee's nonpartisan and objective study of the staffing and organization of our Government for timely planning ahead on the critical issues of national survival, and for effective implementation and follow-through of foreign and defense policies.

Serving with the Senator from Washington on the subcommittee are Senators HUMPHREY, MUSKIE, MUNDT, and JAVITS.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON WORLD REFUGEE PROBLEMS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which I am chairman, will hold a series of hearings on the world refugee problems and U.S. interest and responsibility in its solution. These hearings will be held in room 357 of the Old Senate Office Building and will begin on July 12 at 1 p.m., to continue through July 14.

The subcommittee will hear representatives of the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We will also hear spokesmen for private religious, nationality, and social agencies who have carried on overseas relief activities with refugees. We will hear from a number of distinguished individuals who have recently been abroad and studied the refugee situation.

Our hearings will be directed to an examination of U.S. activities in the field of refugees in all parts of the world. We hope, in these and subsequent hearings, to gather comprehensive factual information on all aspects of the refugee problem, including an evaluation of our programs and efforts up to the present.

The present state of political ferment in the world and the continuation of the cold war suggests that the problem of refugees will be with us for some time to come. The subcommittee will report to the Senate from time to time as our in-

July 10

vestigations progress. I am hopeful these reports will be useful to the Members not only in their consideration of refugee problems but also foreign policy, immigration, and related matters.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from radio address delivered by himself recently over radio station WGN, Chicago, on the subject of "Statesmanship in Labor and Management."

Excerpts from recent radio broadcast by himself over Wisconsin radio stations on the subject of "Alert Confidence," in battling communism.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Address entitled "Faith and Works: The Kiwanis Contribution," delivered by the Honorable Brooks Hays at the Kiwanis International Convention at Toronto, Ontario, on July 2, 1961.

Statement by Donald C. Stone on the proposed act for international development, delivered before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 20, 1961.

By Mr. COTTON:

Address delivered by John W. Guider before the Portland (Maine) Rotary Club on June 23, 1961, on the subject of television programming, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

Editorial entitled "What July Fourth Is All About," published in the Hillsborough (N.H.) Messenger of June 29, 1961.

Editorial entitled "The Tax Is Mounting," published in the Rochester (N.H.) Courier of June 29, 1961.

Editorial entitled "Busy Mount Washington," printed in the Littleton (N.H.) Courier of June 29, 1961; also an editorial entitled "North Conway and the Skimobile in Paris," published in the Berlin (N.H.) Reporter of June 29, 1961.

By Mr. MORSE:

Editorial entitled "Export of Logs to Japan," published in the Oregon Statesman of July 3, 1961.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Editorial entitled "We Should Honor Him?" published in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star of June 11, 1961, relating to a proposed testimonial to Walter Reuther.

Article entitled "Who's To Blame for the High Cost of Living?" written by Arthur Mauch, and reprinted from a recent issue of Successful Farming magazine.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Editorials on the Indiana dunes, published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of June 15, and the Washington Post of July 4.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Article entitled "Texan Keeps Vice President on Time," written by Charlotte Curtis and published in the New York Times of July 5, 1961, relating to Mrs. Elizabeth Carpenter, the new executive assistant to the Vice President.

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

Article entitled "U.S. Science Study Urges Trebled Outlay in Decade," written by John W. Finney and published in the New York Times of July 10, 1961.

By Mr. HARTKE:

Telegram dated June 12, 1961, to Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg from Robert Pastrick, president of the Young Democrats of Indiana; also Secretary Goldberg's reply thereto, containing comments on the administration's economic programs.

Winning essays on the topic, "What Rural Electrification Means to My Community,"

sponsored by the Indiana Rural Electric Membership Corps. in cooperation with the Indiana Rural News.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF PAKISTAN ON JULY 12

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that the distinguished President of Pakistan, His Excellency Mohammed Ayub Khan, will address a joint meeting of the Congress on Wednesday, July 12.

PRIME MINISTER OF NIGERIA TO ADDRESS THE SENATE ON JULY 26

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also announce, for the information of the Senate, that the distinguished Prime Minister of Nigeria, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, will address the Senate on July 26.

BERLIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in this morning's New York Times there appears an article, by C. L. Sulzberger, entitled "Chicken Played With H-Bombs."

It seems to me that in this article, Mr. Sulzberger has put in a most lucid fashion the fundamental question which confronts the world at Berlin. He compares the evolving crisis in that city with the highly irresponsible teenage game of putting two automobiles on a head-on collision path at top speed. This practice is correctly deplored by adults when it involves teenagers in the search for a thrill. Are we now to glorify essentially the same practice when it is pursued by adults in the name of diplomacy? We need to think very deeply about this question, Mr. President. Mr. Sulzberger has performed a highly useful public service by reminding us of this need.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—"CHICKEN" PLAYED WITH H-BOMBS

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, July 9.—The best time to halt trouble is before it starts, but nobody yet involved in the gathering Berlin crisis seems ready to accept this evident logic.

Both East and West give every sign of being convinced that if they respectively show signs of reason these will be interpreted as signs of weakness. The result is a game of "chicken" played with nuclear implications. "Chicken," it may be recalled, is the perverse and juvenile sport of driving two automobiles head-on at each other to see which driver flinches first.

One can draw certain conclusions from the attitudes of both sides. The West has completed its notes to Moscow and is in the process of submitting them to NATO for approval. These express goodwill and a readiness to discuss all problem except under threat of compulsion.

But Khrushchev, whose normal diplomatic methods are too often compulsive, is caught in an odd bind himself. In November 1958, he announced he would sign a separate East

German peace if no new Berlin formula were arranged within 6 months. That was 32 months ago and he has made no irrevocable move.

He, therefore, fears we don't believe him when, as he told President Kennedy in Vienna he promises to move this year if we don't accept a new arrangement. Ever since the Vienna meeting he has been rattling rockets to convince us.

We, on the other hand, regard this technique as precisely the kind of threat under whose shadow we won't negotiate. Our experts argue that if we express too much willingness to talk, Moscow will construe this as yielding.

With the prevalence of this logic—or its lack—the peril mounts. Khrushchev threatens action of the most dangerous sort on the assumption that a United States not tough enough to smash Castro wouldn't dare risk war on Berlin; that Britain and France, preoccupied respectively with bankruptcy and Africa, will in the end back down.

The only way we feel we can impress him is by sternness. Military precautions will soon materialize and, next September, diplomatic preparations will wind up with an Allied summit meeting. If Russia proceeds with its plans for genuine crisis, we won't reply to political moves by force. But we will institute a blockade of the Soviet Union and its satellites to maximize their economic and agricultural difficulties.

This approach by both sides inferentially assumes that no decision can be reached until there is first a crisis, a crisis Khrushchev schedules for next autumn. The trouble is that both West and East, caught in self-fabricated quandaries, believe that when crisis comes the opponent will yield.

Each does its utmost to assure that it means business on Berlin and each suspects the other doesn't believe this is so. Neither wishes to make a gesture of compromise for fear this would be seen as weakness and thereby encourage the adversary to get even tougher.

Neither West nor East wants nuclear war. But each refuses to admit as much for fear of ruining its bargaining position. Consequently both prepare for the eventuality neither wants. There is no danger of nuclear war by governmental calculation. But there is danger of war by individual miscalculation. No matter how deliberately Washington and Moscow plan their moves, neither can insure against human fallibility, against the man who loses his nerve when tension mounts.

This kind of strategy may be suitable to poker but it is scarcely wise in "chicken"—especially when the onrushing automobiles are filled with H-bombs. Nor does that vast portion of the world not committed to either camp seem to do anything about the situation more useful than wringing hands.

U.N., of course, was created to handle precisely this kind of problem. As a nebulous "third party," theoretically without bias, U.N. should right now be intervening before things get entirely out of hand. Otherwise, if neither West nor East is "chicken," North, South and every compass point will be incinerated in the resulting holocaust.

Secretary General Hammarskjöld is clearly detested by Khrushchev and, should he try to suggest sanity, the more resolute Western leaders would be irked because they feel that now is the time for showdown.

It is therefore up to other and neutral nations such as India to apply pressure in U.N. Somebody should propose an alternative to autumnal suicide for the world.

JOINT CANADIAN-UNITED STATES DEFENSE UNDERTAKINGS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, those of us who are from States border-